DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 186 CS 010 896

AUTHOR Mautte, Lois A.
TITLE The Effects of Adult-Interactive Behaviors within the Context of Repeated Storybook Readings upon the Language Development and Selected Prereading Skills of Prekindergarten At Risk Students.
INSTITUTION Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc., Sanibel.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM FERDC, P.O. Box 506, Sanibel, FL 33957 ($3.50 each; 10% discount on an order of 5 or more).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Florida Educational Research Council Research Bulletin; v22 n3 Win 1990

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Beginning Reading; *High Risk Students; Inner City; Intervention; Language Acquisition; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Reading Aloud to Others; Reading Research; *Story Reading
IDENTIFIERS Repeated Readings

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effects of adult-interactive behaviors during repeated storybook readings upon the language development and selected prereading skills of prekindergarten at-risk students. A total of 53 inner city, low socioeconomic status subjects participated in the 20-week study. Subjects were dichotomized at the median on a measure of development level into average- and delayed-development level groups and were then randomly assigned from each of the two development strata to two experimental groups and to one control group. The subjects in experimental group 1 were exposed to adult-interactive behaviors during repeated readings of "big book" storybooks. Subjects in experimental group 2 were exposed to repeated "big book" storybook readings without adult interaction. Control group subjects participated in the regular prekindergarten activities. Results indicated that the subjects in both experimental groups scored significantly higher on the language development tests than the control group subjects, but there was no difference between the two experimental groups. Results further indicated that average-development level subjects also obtained significantly higher scores on both the language development and prereading skills instruments than delayed-development level subjects. (Seventeen references, the story reading model, and the protocols for the second and third storybook reading, and for the repeated storybook reading without adult interaction are attached.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CS

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH COUNCIL

ED344186

RESEARCH BULLETIN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CT Council
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Effects of Adult-Interactive Behaviors Within the Context of Repeated Storybook Readings Upon the Language Development and Selected Prereading Skills of Prekindergarten At Risk Students

by
Lois A. Mautte
Hillsborough County Public Schools

Volume 22 Winter 1990 Number 3

CS010896

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH COUNCIL, INC.

RESEARCH BULLETIN

The Effects of Adult-Interactive Behaviors Within the Context of Repeated Storybook Readings Upon the Language Development and Selected Prereading Skills of Prekindergarten At Risk Students

by
Lois A. Mautte
Hillsborough County Public Schools

Additional copies of this book may be obtained from:
FERDC
P.O. Box 506
Sanibel, Florida 33957

Individual Copies $3.50
Annual Subscription $12.00

10% Discount on an order of 5 or more.
Order of less than $20.00 must be accompanied by
a check or money order.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mel Lucas - 1990-93 PRESIDENT
620 E. University Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601

Frank Green - 1989-92
603 Canal Street
Milton, FL 32570

Cecil Carlton - 1989-92
PAST PRESIDENT
P.O. Box 1470
Pensacola, FL 32597

Esther Oteiza - 1990-93
P.O. Box 670
Ocala, FL 32670

Mary Kay Habgood - 1990-93
TREASURER
215 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, FL 34205

John Headlee - 1991-94
1507 West Main Street
Inverness, FL 32650

Jack McAfee - 1991-1994
P.O. Box 2648
Vero Beach, FL 32960

Sandra McDonald -
1989-92
40 Orange Street
St. Augustine, FL 32084

Lee Rowell - 1990-93
445 W. Amelia Street
Orlando, FL 32802

Don Stone - 1989-92
2055 Central Avenue
Ft. Myers, FL 33901

Ken Dooley - 1988-91
P. O. Box 787
LaBelle, FL 33935

Diane Nichols - 1991-94
530 La Solona Avenue
Arcadia, FL 33821

ADVISORS

Jake Beard
College of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dan Morris
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, FL 33431

William Castine
College of Education
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, FL 32307

Carl Balado
College of Education
University of
Central Florida
Orlando, FL 32816

Charles Hayes
Central Florida Community College
P.O. Box 1388
Ocala, FL 32678

Bette Soldwedel
College of Education
University of
North Florida
Jacksonville, FL 32216

Theresa Vernetsen
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Phyllis NeSmith
Florida School Board
Association
P.O. Box 446
Nocatee, FL 33864

Lee A. Shiver
Florida Education Center
Department of Education
325 W. Gaines Street, Suite 414
Tallahassee, FL 32399

John Follman
College of Education
University of South
Florida
4204 Fowler Avenue
Tampa, FL 33620

Allen Fisher
College of Education
Florida International University
Tamiami Trail
Miami, FL 33199

Sam Mathews
Educational Research &
Development Center
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514

Charlie T. Council
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
P.O. Box 506
Sanibel, FL 33957

COUNCIL MEMBERS

County	Address	Contact Person
Alachua	620 E. University Ave. Gainesville, FL 32601	Mel Lucas
Charlotte	1445 Piatti Drive Punta Gorda, FL 33948	John Wiegman
Citrus	1507 West Main Street Inverness, FL 32650	John Headlee

COUNCIL MEMBERS

County	Address	Contact Person
Collier	3710 Estey Avenue Naples, FL 33942	Roger Otten
DeSoto	530 LaSolona Avenue Arcadia, FL 33821	Diane Nichols
Dixie	Post Office Box 4-V Cross City, FL 32628	Lloyd Jones
Duval	1701 Prudential Drive Jacksonville, FL 32207	John O. Gillespie
Escambia	Post Office Box 1470 Pensacola, FL 32597	Cecil Carlton
Glades	P.O. Box 459 Moore Haven, FL 33471	Linda Taylor
Hamilton	Post Office Box 1059 Jasper, FL 32952	James Coe
Hardee	Post Office Drawer 678 Wauchula, FL 33873	Lee Burns
Hendry	Post Office Box 787 LaBelle, FL 33953	Ken Dooley
Hernando	919 North Broad Street Brooksville, FL 34601	Phyllis McIntyre
Highlands	426 School Street Sebring, FL 33870	Betty Hurlbut
Hillsborough	Post Office Box 3408 Tampa, FL 33601	John Hilderbrand
Indian River	Post Office Box 2648 Vero Beach, FL 32960	Jack McAfee
Lee County	2055 Central Avenue Ft. Myers, FL 33901	Chris Cherau
Madison	Post Office Box 449 Madison, FL 32340	Roy W. Scott
Manatee	215 Manatee Avenue W. Bradenton, FL 34205	Mary K. Habgood
Marion	Post Office Box 670 Ocala, FL 32670	Esther Oteiza

COUNCIL MEMBERS

County	Address	Contact Person
Martin	Post Office Box 1049 Stuart, FL 33494	Terry Horrigan
Nassau	1201 Atlantic Avenue Fernandina Beach, FL 32034	James T. Northey
Okeechobee	100 S.W. 5th Avenue Okeechobee, FL 33472	Danny Mullins
Orange	445 West Amelia Street Orlando, FL 32802	Lee Rowell
Palm Beach	3910 RCA Blvd., Suite 1011 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410	Marc Baron
Pasco	7227 U.S. Highway 41 Land O'Lakes, FL 33537	Madeline Barbery
St. Johns	40 Orange Street St. Augustine, FL 32048	Sandra McDonald
St. Lucie	2909 Delaware Avenue Ft. Pierce, FL 34947	Jayne Hartman
Santa Rosa	603 Canal Street Milton, FL 32570	Frank Green
Sarasota	2418 Hatton Street Sarasota, FL 33577	Rick Nations
Suwannee	224 Parshly Street Live Oak, FL 32060	Marvin Johns
Taylor	Post Office Box 509 Perry, FL 32347	Lester Padgett
Union	55 S.W. 6th Street Lake Butler, FL 32054	Ray Dukes
Wakulla	Post Office Box 100 Crawfordville, FL 32327	Jan Putnal

F.E.R.C. NOTES ON THIS BULLETIN

It has always been a common belief that adult interactive behaviors with children at an early pre-school age such as story reading, story telling and other positive verbal interaction, would provide the readiness necessary for children to have reading success in kindergarten and first grade.

At risk students are less likely to have had this readiness available to them prior to entering school. This study by Lois Mautte addressed this problem in a scholarly manner. F.E.R.C. is pleased to share her findings with member Districts, Subscribers, Researchers and Practitioners.

Charlie T. Council
Executive Director

THE EFFECTS OF ADULT-INTERACTIVE BEHAVIORS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF REPEATED STORYBOOK READINGS UPON THE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND SELECTED PREREADING SKILLS OF PREKINDERGARTEN AT RISK STUDENTS

Abstract

The study examined the effects of adult-interactive behaviors during repeated storybook readings upon the language development and selected prereading skills of prekindergarten At Risk students. A total of 53 inner city, low socioeconomic status (SES) subjects participated in the 20-week study. Subjects were dichotomized at the median on a measure of development level into average-and delayed-development level groups and were then randomly assigned from each of the two development strata to two experimental groups and to one control. group. The subjects in Experimental Group 1 were exposed to adult-interactive behaviors during repeated readings of "big book" storybooks. Subjects in Experimental Group 2 were exposed to repeated "big book" storybook readings without adult interaction. Control group subjects participated in the regular prekindergarten activities. The results indicated the subjects in both experimental groups scored significantly higher on the language development test than the control group subjects, but there was no difference between the two experimental groups. Average-development level subjects also obtained significantly higher scores on both the language development and prereading skills instruments than delayed-development level subjects.

INTRODUCTION

Research dealing with the effects of storybook reading upon children's literacy skills is quite extensive. In general, correlational and experimental studies have found that reading aloud activities enhance children's language and vocabulary development (Burroughs, 1972; Chomsky, 1972; Fodor, 1966; Irwin, 1960; MacKinnon, 1959: Taylor, 1976), academic readiness (Lyons, 1972; Schanze, Goetze, & Colburn, 1988; Walker & Kerbitz, 1978), and interest and desire to read (Birnbaum, 1981; Mason & Blanton, 1971; Mendoza 1985). Recently researcher have employed qualitative designs to examine the interactive behaviors of parents and children during one-to-one storybook readings and have identified specific adult behaviors that appear to have a beneficial influence upon literacy development (Cornell, Senechal, & Broda, 1988; Flood, 1977; Heath, 1980). Naturalistic researchers have also documented adult-child interactions during repeated storybook readings and have noted that children's comments and questions increased and became more interpretive and evaluative when they had listened to repeated readings of the same story (Martinez & Roser, 1985; Morrow. 1988; Snow, 1983; Sulzby, 1985; Yaden, 1985). Little experimental research exists regarding the effect of adult-interactive behaviors in combination with repeated storybook readings upon students' specific literacy skills.

It is within this context that the present research was conducted. This study sought to employ an experimental approach to investigate the effects of adult-interactive behaviors during repeated storybook readings upon the language development and selected pre-reading skills of groups of 4-year-old At Risk students.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample was initially composed of 66, 4-year-old prekindergarten subjects who were enrolled in six At Risk program classes located in an early childhood education center in the inner city of Hillsborough County, Florida. The subjects' scores on the Children's Inventory of Learning Development Test (CHILD) were dichotomized on development at the median into average-development level and delayed-development level groups. Subjects were then randomly assigned from each of the two development strata to three levels of treatment: (a) adult-interaction repeated storybook reading, (b) repeated storybook reading without adult interaction, and (c) a control group which followed the prescribed prekindergarten curriculum of the county. Each treatment group contained 22 subjects, equally divided between average-development and delayed-development level students.

During pretesting, 3 subjects withdrew from the At Risk program classes (1 average development E1 group subject, 1 average-development level E2 group subject, and 1 delayed-development level control group subject), thus leaving a total of 21 subjects within each treatment group. Ten additional subjects were lost through attrition during the 20-week treatment period. The final sample contained a total of 53 subjects. There were 27 females and 26 males, of whom 5 were white, 2 were Hispanic, and 46 were black.

Design

A Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design was used for this experimental study. There were two independent variables: (a) the presence or absence of adult-interactive behaviors in combination with repeated readings, and (b) development level, as measured by the Children's Inventory of Learning Development Test. The dependent variables were: (a) language development, as measured by the Preschool Language Scale, and (b) selected prereading skills, as measured by the Test of Early Reading Ability.

Procedures

Pretesting

Pretesting began on December 5, 1989, and ran for a period of 14 school days. The researcher and a trained research assistant administered the Preschool Language Scale and the Test of Early Reading Ability to each of the subjects in the three treatment groups. Both of these tests were untimed and were administered on an individual basis. Therefore, each subject was individually pretested in an area of the building that was quiet and free from distraction. The order and time of administration of the two tests was counterbalanced among the groups. A testing schedule was developed and followed by the researcher and research assistant. Any additional interpersonal considerations that were suggested in the test manuals of the measurement devices were also followed during pretest administration.

Procedures for the Adult-Interaction Repeated Storybook Reading Group

The subjects in the adult-interaction repeated storybook reading group were exposed to the first level of treatment in this study. The researcher administered the treatment to the subjects in this group. For instructional purposes within each treatment class, the subjects in the group were randomly assigned across development levels to three small groups of subjects. Each small group of subjects was read one Big Book storybook, 3 times per week, for 20 weeks. Consequently, a total of 20 Big Books were read on a repetitive basis during the 20-week treatment period.

During the first storybook reading session each week, the researcher implemented a story reading model. This model was developed from a number of sources which included: (a) the findings of research studies of adult-interactive behaviors during storybook readings (Cornell et al., 1988; Flood, 1977; Heath, 1980; Lamme & Packer, 1986; Ninio & Bruner, 1978); (b) recommendations of authorities within the field of children's literature (Morrow, 1989; Routman, 1988; Strickland, 1988; Strickland & Morrow, 1989); and (c) Holdaway's (1979) Shared Book Experience reading techniques. Because questioning was an integral component of this model, W. Dorsey Hammond's (1986) questioning techniques were also incorporated into the design. The specific protocol for this model is contained in Appendix 1.

In implementing the model, the researcher engaged in adult interaction before, during, and after the storybook reading. Before the story was read, the researcher introduced the book by pointing to and reading the title and encouraged the subjects to generate predictions about the story events or characters while looking at the illustrations contained in the book. The researcher also generated prequestions that related the story contents to the subjects' real-life experiences and also established a specific purpose for listening to the story.

While reading the story, all interaction was focused on the text; and the researcher showed the illustrations and used a pointer to emphasize left-to-right progression and the correspondence between spoken and written words. During the reading, the researcher clarified and explained information in the text, asked inferential questions that encouraged the subjects to use knowledge which they already had, and also posed questions that were directed toward the immediate objective or purpose for listening. The subjects were also asked to generate additional predictions concerning the story content during this phase of the reading session.

Upon completion of the story, the researcher directed all discussion toward the purpose that was initially established for listening to the story, posed questions that required the subjects to generate evaluative responses, and also related the concepts contained in the text to the subjects' life experiences.

During the second reading of the storybook, the researcher also engaged in adult interaction, using a protocol which was developed from the findings of research studies (Coombs, 1987; Cornell et al., 1988; Elley, 1989; Flood, 1977; Heath, 1980; Lamme & Packer, 1986; Morrow, 1988; Ninio & Bruner, 1987), and from Holdaway's (1979) Shared Book Experience reading techniques. Appendix 2 contains the protocol for this reading.

Because the subjects had previously encountered an oral reading of the text, the primary purpose of this storybook reading was to elicit more elaborative responses and encourage student participation in the storybook reading event. Prior to reading the story, the researcher asked the subjects to recall the title and contents of the text, and scaffolded responses if the subjects were unable to answer. While reading the story, all interaction was focused on the text; and the researcher showed the illustrations and used a pointer to track the print. In order to generate participation in the oral reading of the story, the researcher hesitated at predictable parts of the text and allowed the subjects to fill in possible words or phrases, and also encouraged the subjects to formulate predictions and chant the repetitive phrases contained the text. Questioning techniques were

used to elicit elaborative responses during the oral reading of the text. For example, the researcher asked the subjects to recall the previous events which had occurred in the story. After the story was read, the post-discussion was directed towards eliciting the subjects' evaluative responses.

For the third storybook reading session, the researcher also used a protocol which was developed from the findings of research studies (Coombs, 1987; Cornell et al., 1988; Elley, 1989; Flood, 1977; Heath, 1980; Lamme & Packer, 1986; Morrow, 1988, Ninio & Bruner, 1987), and from Holdaway's (1979) Shared Book Experience reading techniques. Appendix 3 contains the protocol for the third storybook reading.

Because the repeated storybook reading research had indicated that students' comments and questions increased and became more interpretive and evaluative with each successive rereading of the text (Hoffman, 1976; Martinez & Roser, 1985; Morrow, 1988; Snow, 1983; Yaden, 1988), the third storybook reading session was primarily directed towards eliciting the subjects' responses. However, the subjects were also encouraged to actively participate in the oral reading of the text.

Prior to reading the story, the researcher asked the subjects to recall the title and contents of the text and scaffolded dialogue if the subjects failed to generate responses. In order to elicit responses during the oral reading of the story, the researcher asked inferential questions and queried the subjects about the major story events. The researcher also encouraged the subjects to actively participate in the oral reading of the text by chanting repetitive refrains and filling in predictable words and phrases. Questioning techniques were employed during the post-discussion of the text, and the subjects were encouraged to draw inferences and to generate evaluative responses concerning specific story events.

The treatment phase of the study began in December, 1989, immediately following the pretesting period, and continued until May, 1990. Each of the three storybook reading sessions each week lasted for a maximum of 25 minutes. The treatment sessions were conducted in the morning during the large block of activity time. Because of the school schedule, the three small groups of E1 subjects were taken in the same order each day. In order to administer the treatment in an atmosphere which was free from distractions, the subjects were taken from their classrooms and brought to an unoccupied classroom for the storybook readings. Upon completion of each storybook reading session, the subjects returned to the regular curricular activities (see Procedures for Control Group).

Procedures for the Repeated Storybook Reading Without Adult-Interaction Group

The subjects in the repeated storybook reading without adult-interaction group were exposed to the second level of treatment in this study. The researcher was responsible for administering the treatment to the subjects in this group.

For instructional purposes within each treatment class, the subjects were randomly assigned across development levels to three small groups of subjects. Each small group of subjects was read the same Big Book as the subjects in the adult-interaction repeated storybook reading group. Each book was also read 3 times per week for 20 weeks. However, the story reading model and the protocols for the second and third readings were not implemented with the subjects in this group. Instead, the subjects were exposed to a straight unembellished reading of the story text. Appendix 4 contains the story reading protocol which was used with the subjects in this group.

During the first storybook reading session each week, the researcher introduced the book by pointing to and reading the title and then immediately turned to the first page of the story and began reading the text. While reading the story, the researcher showed the illustrations and also used a pointer to track the print. However, the researcher showed the illustrations and also used a pointer to track the print. However, the researcher did not initiate any discussion concerning the story contents. In the event that the subjects generated comments concerning the main characters or story events, the researcher did not respond to the subjects' comments. If a subject asked a question while the researcher was reading, the researcher informed the subject that the question would be answered immediately following the reading of the text. Upon completion of the story, the researcher closed the book and answered questions that the subjects may have asked during the oral reading. However, the researcher did not ask any questions about the text material.

The second and third storybook reading sessions followed the same format as the first session. Consequently, the same protocol was used for the second and third readings (Appendix 4). The title of the story was read, and the researcher immediately began reading the text. As in the first session, the researcher refrained from discussing the story contents and did not elicit responses and did not

encourage the subjects to participate in the oral reading of the story. However, in the event that the subjects independently initiated participatory behaviors, such as repeating repetitive words or phrases in the story, the researcher neither indicated approval nor disapproval of such behaviors.

Each of the three storybook reading sessions lasted for a maximum of 25 minutes, and was conducted in the morning during the large block of activity time. Because of the school schedule, the three small groups of E2 subjects were taken in the same order each day, immediately following the E1 group treatment sessions. The researcher escorted the subjects to an unoccupied classroom for the treatment sessions. After each treatment session, the subjects returned to the regular curricular activities (see Procedures for Control Group).

Procedures for the Control Group

The subjects in the control group were under the direct supervision of the prekindergarten classroom teachers and aides`s and engaged in the activities which were specified in the High Scope Curriculum.

Posttesting

Posttesting began at the conclusion of the 20-week treatment period and lasted for 14 school days. The researcher and a trained research assistant administered the Preschool Language Scale and the Test of Early Reading Ability to the subjects within each of the treatment groups. Each subject was individually tested in an area of the building that was quiet and free from distraction. As for pretesting, the order and time of administration of the two tests was counterbalanced among the groups. A testing schedule was developed and followed by the researcher and research assistant.

RESULTS

Two separate analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were performed on the subjects' language development and prereading skill scores. The subjects' pretest scores were used as the covariate in each separate analysis. The results of the one-way ANCOVA performed on the language development data indicated a significant main effect of treatment ($p < .0001$). Multiple comparisons, using the Scheffé Test for Adjusted Means procedures, were conducted among the groups: Experimental Group 1 vs. Control, Experimental Group 2 vs. Control, and Experimental Group 1 vs. Experimental Group 2. The results indicated there were significant differences in favor of the treatment groups as compared to the control group: the E1 group scored significantly higher than the control group on the language development dependent variable; the E2 group also scored significantly higher than the control group on the dependent variable. However, there was no significant difference between the E1 and E2 groups. The one-way ANCOVA test for main effects of treatment on prereading skills was not statistically significant ($p < .2686$), thus indicating there were no significant differences in group performance on the prereading skills dependent variable.

In order to focus upon the main effects of development levels and interaction effects without interferences from the covariate, two separate, two-way (development level by treatment) analyses of variance (ANOVA) were also performed on the language development and prereading skills data. The results of the two-way ANOVA conducted on the language development data indicated a significant treatment effect ($p < .0001$) and development level effect ($p < .0001$). There was no significant interaction effect between development levels and treatments ($p < .1577$). Scheffé multiple comparisons were performed among the groups and confirmed the findings obtained in the ANCOVA. The subjects in both experimental groups scored significantly higher than the control group subjects on the language development dependent variable. However, there was no significant difference between the E1 and E2 groups. The significant development level effect indicated that the average-development level subjects obtained significantly higher scores on the language development measures than the delayed-development level subjects.

A significant development level effect ($p < .0002$) was also obtained in the two-way ANOVA performed on the prereading skills data and indicated that the average-development level subjects obtained significantly higher scores on the prereading skills measures than the

delayed-development level subjects. The F tests for treatment effects ($p<.1872$) and interaction effects between development levels and treatment ($p<.2515$) were not statistically significant.

CONCLUSIONS

The Interactive Dimension of the Treatment

In this study, the researcher proscribed the adult interaction that was used with the subjects in both experimental groups. With the subjects in the first level of treatment, the researcher implemented a story reading model and reading protocols that incorporated adult-interactive behaviors and questioning techniques. Appendixes 1-3 contain the story reading model and reading protocols that were used with the subjects.

Throughout the 20-week period, the researcher noted that the treatment appeared to be effective in terms of eliciting the subjects' responses and in generating their participatory behaviors. For example, the subjects actively engaged in the storybook readings by reading the lines of the text along with the researcher, chanting repetitive refrains, and filling in predictable words and phrases in the story. The subjects also read lines and entire pages of dialogue in advance of the researcher's reading, and recalled story events, characters, and exact lines of dialogue contained in books that had been read 5 weeks previously. In addition, they emulated the dialogue and behavior of the researcher in introducing the book. For example, upon entering the room where the treatment sessions were held, the subjects would reach for the pointer (ruler) that was used to track the print, sit in a chair, point to the title of the book and say, "The title of the story that I'm going to read is _____."

In responding to questions, a number of the subjects used words which were indicative of highly developed vocabulary structures, such as "aggravated," "annoyed," and "greedy." Furthermore, as repeated storybook reading studies have indicated (Martinez & Roser, 1985; Morrow, 1988, Snow, 1983; Sulzby, 1985; Yaden, 1985), the subjects' responses increased and became more interpretive and evaluative after they had listened to repeated readings of the same story. For example, in response to the question, "Do you think that it was a good idea for Minnie (the monkey) to fly on a blanket?" one of the subjects stated: "No, monkeys can't fly–Minnie should have gone on an airplane–that's the only way a monkey can fly." The observed behaviors were present among both average - and delayed-

development level subjects. At first, the average-development level subjects initiated the majority of responses. However, as the treatment sessions progressed over time, the delayed-development level subjects provided as many responses as the average-development level subjects.

In contrast to the adult-interaction repeated storybook reading treatment, in which discussion and questioning techniques were integral components of the treatment, the repeated storybook reading without adult-interaction treatment consisted of a straight unembellished reading of the story. With the subjects in this level of treatment, the researcher introduced the book and read it in its entirety without engaging in any discussion of the story contents. A stipulation was also made that in the event the subjects independently initiated participatory behaviors, the researcher would neither indicate approval nor disapproval of such behaviors.

Although the researcher strictly maintained the differences in the two experimental treatments throughout the 20-week study, the interactive dimension of the adult-interaction repeated storybook reading treatment appeared to be present in the repeated storybook reading without adult-interaction group (E2), in that many of the subjects initiated the same type of behaviors as the E1 group subjects. For example, the subjects read the story along with the researcher, filled in predictable words and phrases in advance of the researcher's reading, and predicted events in the story, despite the lack of an invitation to predict what would happen next. They also remembered story characters and exact lines of dialogue contained in books that had been previously read, and emulated the behavior of the researcher in introducing the book by reaching for the ruler, pointing to the title of the book, and reading the title of the story.

There were also several occasions in which the E2 group subjects exhibited behaviors that were not observed during the treatment sessions with the E1 group subjects. For example, at the conclusion of one storybook reading session, a delayed-development level subject turned the pages of the Big Book and retold the story. Although the subject's story retelling was mainly focused on the illustrations contained in the text, it appeared that the subject had grasped most of the story content. In fact, on the following day, this subject approached the researcher in the cafeteria during breakfast and said, "Are you gonna read that book again–If You Give a Mouse a Cookie"? In addition, on several occasions, another delayed-development level subject tracked the print with his finger and repeated the lines in the story as the researcher conducted the reading.

The storybook readings not only appeared to have an effect upon the E1 and E2 groups' interactive behaviors during the treatment sessions, but they also had an apparent influence upon the subjects' reading-related behaviors (looking at illustrations in storybooks, pretending to read stories) within the classroom setting. Just as naturalistic research studies have indicated (Holdaway, 1979; Sulzby, 1985), after the subjects had been exposed to repeated storybook readings, they looked at illustrations, tracked the print, and either pretended to read or actually read the words and sentences contained in storybooks.

A total of 20 incidences of reading-related behaviors were observed within one of the prekindergarten classrooms throughout the 20-week treatment period. The observations were not planned and occurred as the researcher entered the classroom to pick up subjects for the treatment sessions. Furthermore, the observations were made during activity time, when the subjects were free to participate in interest area activities.

Because all 20 observations occurred within one of the prekindergarten classrooms, it was necessary to determine whether the classroom teacher engaged in story reading behaviors that were similar to the ones implemented during the treatment sessions. Therefore, the researcher observed the classroom teacher reading to the class and found that the teacher engaged in a straight unembellished reading of the story text and did not track the print while reading the story. Thus, it would appear that the subjects' independent reenactments of storybook reading sessions could be attributed to the repeated storybook reading treatments. Furthermore, the experimental E1 and E2 group subjects' independent behaviors during the treatment sessions and within the classroom setting may in part be responsible for the similar performance of the two groups on the language development measure. The frequent exposure to language which was provided to both groups through the repeated storybook readings may also have contributed to their significant performance on the language development measure.

Suggestions for Additional Research

This research study was conducted to examine the possibility that adult-interactive behaviors during repeated readings may serve to

enhance prekindergarten at-risk students' literacy skills. Because the results would appear to suggest that prekindergarten students' language development may be enhanced through repeated storybook reading whether or not adult interaction is provided, many questions still remain unanswered concerning the specific influence of adult-interactive behaviors upon students' literacy skills. Replication studies are, therefore, needed to determine if similar results would be obtained with a larger sample of average-development level and delayed-development level at-risk students drawn from inner city early childhood centers. Relocation studies could also be conducted in which groups of inner city at-risk subjects are compared with groups of at-risk subjects in rural early childhood centers to determine whether similarities are noted in the performance of subjects in different educational settings.

Although the intent of this study was to examine the effects of two experimental treatments upon the subjects' measured literacy skills, observations made of the subjects within the classroom setting indicated that the treatments also has an influence upon the subjects' (E1 and E2) reading-related behaviors. Research studies that incorporate experimental and observation procedures would provide useful insights into other literacy processes that may be affected by adult interaction and repeated readings.

This research study targeted a specific group of prekindergarten students who are at risk of potential academic failure. Studies of at-risk children have just begun to emerge. Many of the studies (Reynolds, 1990) have sought to identify factors that contribute to low socioeconomic level children's academic success in later years. One of the factors that continually emerges in these studies is early intervention and the necessity of providing enriching educational experiences during the preschool years. Storybook reading can be an enriching experience. The additional research that deals with adult-interactive behaviors in combination with repeated readings may provide the pertinent information that is needed in order to develop the type of storybook reading experiences that will fully enhance the literacy development of students who might otherwise encounter failure in their efforts to read. In 1908, E.B. Huey stated, "The secret of it all lies in reading aloud to and with the child (p. 332, cited in Teale, 1981). Future research findings may indicate that Huey's statement may, indeed, have been correct.

References

Burroughs, M. (1972). The simulation of verbal behavior in culturally disadvantaged three-year-olds. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 972). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 32*, 6890A.

Chomsky, C. (1972). Stages in language development and reading exposure. *Harvard Educational Review, 12*, 1-33.

Cornell, E.H., Senechal, M., & Broda, L.S. (1988). Recall of picture books by 3-year-old children: Testing and repetition effects in joint reading activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 537-542.

Flood, J. (1977). Parental styles in reading episodes with young children. *The Reading Teacher, 30*, 864-867.

Heath, S.B. (1980). The functions and uses of literacy. *Journal of Communications, 30*, 123-133.

Holdaway, D. (1979). *The foundations of literacy*. Sydney, Australia: Ashton Scholastic.

Irwin, O.C. (1960). Infant speech: Effect of systematic reading of stories. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 3*, 187-190.

Lyons, P.A. (19720. The effect of children's literature and oral discussion on the reading achievement of first and second grade children. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 33*, 4246A. (University Microfilms No. 73-2058).

MacKinnon, P. (1959). *How do children learn to read?* Montreal: The Capp Publishing Company.

Martinez, M., & Roser, N. (1985). Read it again: The value of repeated readings during story time. *The Reading Teacher*, 38, 782-786.

Mason, G., & Blanton, W. (1971). Story content for beginning reading instruction. *Elementary English, 48*, 793-796.

Morrow, L.M. (1988). Young children's responses to one-to-one story reading in school settings. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23 (1), 89-107.

Reynolds, A.J. (1990, April). *Source of fading effects of prekindergarten experience*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Snow, C.E., & Goldfield, B.A. (1983) Turn the page please: Situation specific language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language, 10,* 535-549.

Sulzby, E. (1985). Children's emergent reading of favorite storybooks: A developmental study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 458-479.

Walker, G.H., & Kuerbitz, I.E. (1978). Reading to preschoolers as an aid to successful beginning reading. *Reading Improvement, 16,* 149-154.

Yaden, D. (1985). Understanding stories through repeated read alouds: How many does it take? *The Reading Teacher, 41,* 556-560.

APPENDIX 1

STORY READING MODEL

I. **Prepare for Listening with Questions and Discussion.**

A. Introduce the story with background information.

1. Introduce the book by pointing to the title. Say: "The title of the story that I am going to read is _____." "This is the title on the front of the book."

2. Encourage students to predict what the story will be about. Say: "Let's look at the pictures to see if you can tell me what the story is going to be about."

a. Show the illustrations in the book and encourage the students to respond as the pages are turned.

b. After they have offered their predictions, say: "The story is about _____."

3. Demonstrate pleasure and interest in anticipation of the reading.

B. Ask prequestions that build additional background for listening and that establish a purpose for listening.

1. Whenever possible, generate prequestions that relate the story content to the students' real-life experiences. For example, say: "Have you ever _____?"

2. Establish a purpose for listening. Say: "While I'm reading, try to decide if you think _____."

II. **Prepare the Story and Focus All Interaction on the Text.**

A. Rehearse the reading prior to reading the story to the students for ease and expression.

B. Engage in enthusiastic reading of the story. Display delight and interest in the language and story line. Use appropriate reading

aloud techniques, such as suitable speed, proper enunciation, volume, and intonation.

C. Use a pointer during reading to emphasize left-to-right progression and correspondence between spoken and written words.

D. Show the illustrations while reading the story.

E. Pause at natural breaks for students' reactions, comments, and questions. Answer questions as they are asked, and respond to comments.

F. Redirect all irrelevant discussion back to the story.

G. Ask questions that drive the flow of the story. For example, ask: "What is the problem that _____ has?" "Why is _____ in trouble?"

H. Model or scaffold responses for students which are directed toward the immediate objective or purpose for listening. For example, say: "Can you remember what _____?" "How have _____?" If the students do not respond, scaffold or model the responses by changing the questions to statements.

I. While reading the story, hesitate at predictable parts in the text and query students about what might happen next. After students offer predictions, say: "Let's keep reading to find out if that happens."

J. Offer positive reinforcement for the students' comments and questions.

III. **Discuss After Reading.**

A. Post-discussion should be guided by the purpose established for listening to the story. In discussing the story, emphasize inferential and evaluative questions. For example, say: "Do you think the _____?" "Why?" "What would you have done if _____?"

B. Relate the concepts in the story to the students' life experiences.

APPENDIX 2

PROTOCOL FOR SECOND STORYBOOK READING

I. **Elicit Student Recall.**

A. Point to the title of the book and ask the students if they remember the title of the story. If the students do not recall the title, scaffold the response by reading the title.

B. Ask the students if they remember the contents of the story. Say: "Does anyone remember what the story was about?"

1. As the students respond, offer positive reinforcement for their comments and responses.

2. Scaffold responses if the students are unable to answer. Say: "The story is about _____."

II. **Read the Story and Focus All Interaction on the Text.**

A. Encourage the students to participate in the story reading. Say: "Help me read the story."

B. Engage in enthusiastic reading of the story. Display delight and interest in the language and story line. Use appropriate reading aloud techniques, such as suitable speed, proper enunciation, volume, and intonation.

C. Use a pointer during reading to emphasize left-to-right progression and correspondence between spoken and written words.

D. Show the illustrations while reading the story.

E. Encourage the students to chant repetitive phrases in the story, such as, "I know an old lady who swallowed a fly."

F. Hesitate at predictable parts in the text and allow students to fill in possible words or phrases. For example, say: "Run, run as fast as you can. You can't catch me, _____."

G. Ask questions that encourage the students to recall previous events which have occurred in the story. For example: say: "What happened the last time that _____?" Scaffold the answer if students are unable to respond.

H. Ask questions that also drive the flow of the story. For example, ask: "What is the problem that _____ has?"

I. Encourage the students to generate predictions concerning the story events. For example, ask: "And what do you think will happen next time?"

III. **Discuss After Reading**

A. In discussing the story, pose questions that require the students to formulate evaluative responses. For example, ask: "What would you have done if _____?"

B. Relate the concepts in the story to the students' life experiences.

APPENDIX 3

PROTOCOL FOR THIRD STORYBOOK READING

I. **Evoke Prior Knowledge of the Text.**

A. Point to the title of the book and ask the students if they recall the title of the story. If the students do not respond, scaffold the response by reading the title.

B. Ask the students if they remember the contents of the story. Say: "Who remembers what the story was about?"

1. Offer positive reinforcement for the students' responses.

2. If the students are unable to answer, scaffold responses by providing an overview of the story. For example, say: "The story was about _____."

II. **Read the Story and Focus All Interaction on the Text.**

A. Encourage the students to participate in the oral reading. Say: "Help me read the story."

B. Show the illustrations while reading the story and use a pointer to track the print. Engage in enthusiastic reading of the story. Use appropriate reading aloud techniques, such as suitable speed, proper enunciation, volume, and intonation.

C. Encourage the students to chant repetitive phrases in the story.

D. Pause before predictable words or phrases and let the students fill them in.

E. While reading the story, ask questions that require the students to draw inferences. For example, ask: "Why did that happen? or "What caused _____?"

F. Hesitate at predictable parts in the text and ask the students to recall what happened next.

III. **Discuss After Reading.**

A. Ask questions that require the students to recall the main sequence of story events. For example, ask: "What was the first thing that _____?" "What was the next thing that happened?"

B. In discussing the story, also emphasize inferential and evaluative questions, such as "What would have happened if _____?" or "What would you have done if _____? "Why?"

C. Relate the concepts in the story to the students' life experiences.

APPENDIX 4

PROTOCOL FOR REPEATED STORYBOOK READING WITHOUT ADULT-INTERACTION GROUP

I. **Introduce the Story.**

A. Introduce the book by pointing to the title. Say: "The title of the story that I am going to read today is _____."

B. Turn to the first page of the story and immediately begin reading the text.

II. **Read the Story Without Engaging in Discussion of the Contents.**

A. Use a pointer during reading to emphasize left-to-right progression and correspondence between spoken and written words.

B. Show the illustrations while reading the story. Engage in enthusiastic reading of the story. Use appropriate reading aloud techniques, such as suitable speed, proper enunciation, volume, and intonation.

C. Do not respond to any of the comments that the students may generate concerning the main characters or story events.

D. In the event that a student asks a question, inform the student that the question will be answered immediately after the story is read.

E. Read the entire story without discussing any aspects of the text.

III. **After Reading the Story.**

A. Upon completion of the story, close the book.

B. Answer any questions that the students may have asked during the oral reading. However, do not ask the students if they have any questions about the story.

C. Return the students to their classrooms.